

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/692,465	10/23/2003	Brad L. Noll	1940-031320	7255	
28289	7590 02/22/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER .	
	B LAW FIRM, P.C.		KRISHNAMURTHY, RAMESH		
	RS BUILDING TH AVENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PITTSBURG	GH, PA 15219		3753		

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/692,465	NOLL ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Ramesh Krishnamurthy	3753				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	pears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failt Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Densions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ATE OF THE OF T	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 D	<u> December 2005</u> .					
2a)	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa	ince except for formal matters, p	prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	tion of Claims						
4)🖂	4) Claim(s) 1 - 32 is/are pending in the application.						
,_	4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	<ul> <li>✓ Claim(s) 1 - 9, 11 - 20, 22 - 25, 28, 30, 32 is/are rejected.</li> <li>✓ Claim(s) 26,27,29 and 31 is/are objected to.</li> </ul>						
7)🖂							
_ 8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Applicat	tion Papers						
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
	The drawing(s) filed on 07/04(replacement she		cepted or b) objected to by the				
Examine							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	ce Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document  2. Certified copies of the priority document  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document  application from the International Burea  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicate to the price of the price	ation No ived in this National Stage				
Attachme	nt(s)						
	ice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗍 Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail					
3) 🛛 Info	ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/04</u> .		al Patent Application (PTO-152)				

This office action is responsive to communications filed 12/14/2005.

## Claims 1 – 32 are pending.

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Species A in the reply filed on 12/14/2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a search would be the same for all the species. This argument is not found persuasive because it fails to evince an appreciation that the species claimed are not patentably distinct. That is, the election of species requirement was made on the basis that the claimed species are, in fact, patentably distinct, and not on the basis of how they are searched. Applicant's argument that 'they could all be searched in one search" does not render the once considered patentably distinct species now not patentably distinct. Claims 10 and 21 are withdrawn for further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

## Claims 1 - 9, 11 - 20 and 22 - 32 remain for further consideration.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1 9, 11 13, 15 20, 22 25, 28, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 00/70246.

The document WO'246 discloses a modular casing or a check valve arrangement that comprises a housing having an inlet end (44) and an outlet end (48) defining a flow channel therebetween, a modular cage (56) removably secured to said

Application/Control Number: 10/692,465 Page 3

Art Unit: 3753

housing, the modular cage having an interior cavity wherein at least one check valve assembly (72, 74) is removably placed. A fluid seal each (68, 70) in the form of a gasket is positioned at the two ends of the modular cage for sealing the cage within the flow channel the housing. A lug (78) extending outwardly from said housing, the lug defining an orifice (85) adapted to receive a fastener (90). The modular cage defines at least one protrusion (86) having a slot (88) aligned with said orifice of said lug whereby the fastener (90) passes through the slot and the orifice for securing said modular cage to the housing. The modular cage shows a lip near the location where channel (98) is joined to the modular cage in Fig. 11. It is noted that the arrangement disclosed in WO'246 necessarily performs the method recited in claims 25, 28, 30 and 32 in its usual and normal operation.

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Application/Control Number: 10/692,465

Art Unit: 3753

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/70246.

The document WO'246 discloses the claimed invention with the exception of explicitly disclosing the first diameter portion of the interior cavity has a diameter that is less than that of the second diameter portion.

The provision of a first diameter portion of the interior cavity having a diameter that is less than that of the second diameter portion is considered to be an obvious design expedient over those features in WO'246 in that it neither provides any new and/or unexpected result nor solves any stated problem.

- 7. Claims 26, 27, 29 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramesh Krishnamurthy whose telephone number is (571) 272 – 4914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 10:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Keasel, can be reached on (571) 272 – 4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 – 8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Application/Control Number: 10/692,465

Art Unit: 3753

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 5

Ramesh Krishnamurthy, Ph.D., PE

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3753